UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

[illegible]	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
v.	:	Civil Action
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,	:	No. 2301-79
Defendants	:	

MEMORANDUM OF PLAINTIFF IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Plaintiff denies that there are no issues of material fact and that there is no claim upon which relief can be granted.

I.

QUESTIONS OF FACT AND MIXED QUESTIONS OF FACT AND LAW

In its "Preliminary Statement" on page 1 of its Memorandum of Points and Authorities," defendant states that "the requested permission to inspect certain spectrographic analyses of bullets and bullet fragments recovered from the scene of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy in Dallas, Texas, November 22, 1963."

Bullets and bullet fragments may have been "recovered" in Dealey Plaza, the "scene" of the assassination, on November 22, 1963. However, if so, plaintiff is unaware of any evidence that bullets or bullet fragments were "recovered" from a place of hiding in the Texas School Book Depository Building and it is plaintiff's belief that this was not the case.

Page 1

[redacted]

HAROLD WEISBERG,

Plaintiff,

v. Civil Action

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, No. 1966-70

Defendant

[redacted]

[redacted]

ANSWER OF PLAINTIFF TO DEFENDANT'S ANSWER TO MOTION TO, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, SEE SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Plaintiff denies that there are no issues of material fact and that there is no claim upon which relief can be granted.

2.

[redacted]

In the "Preliminary Statement" on page 1 of its "Memorandum of Points and Authorities," defendant states that plaintiff "has requested permission to inspect certain spectrographic analyses of bullets and bullet fragments recovered from the scene of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy in Dallas, Texas on November 22, 1963."

Bullets and bullet fragments may have been "recovered" in Dealey Plaza the "scene" of the assassination, on November 22, 1963. However, if so, plaintiff is unaware of them; a fragment or fragments were "recovered" from a piece of cubing in Dealey Plaza but it is plaintiff's belief that this was as late as July, 1964.

the bullets and bullet fragments, spectrographic analysis of which are sought by plaintiff, were "recovered" primarily on November 22nd, the date of the assassination, but some were "recovered" on November 23rd and at later times. They were "recovered" generally not at the "scene" but at Dallas' Parkland Hospital, Bethesda Naval Hospital in Maryland, and at other places, including Washington, D.C.

More important, defendant states as a matter of fact (see page one of his Statement of Material Fact) that the records sought "are part of an 'investigatory file compiled for law enforcement purposes.'" It is plaintiff's contention that this is incorrect and that the records in fact were not compiled for a law enforcement purpose but exclusively as part of an investigation requested by President Lyndon B. Johnson on November 29, Executive Order 11130; and S. J. Res. 137, 88th Congress, both of which involved "law enforcement."

The remainder of this answer will deal with this question which appears to be a mixed question of fact and law.

II.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

On page two of its Memorandum of Points and Authorities defendant properly cites exemption (b)(7) correctly as "investigatory files compiled for law enforcement purposes except to the extent available by law to a party other than an agency." Cliff then adds: "The thrust of the exemption is to protect from disclosure all files which the government compiles in the course of law enforcement investigations which may or may not lead

The bullets and bullet fragments, spectrographic analyses of which are sought by plaintiff, were "recovered" primarily on November 22nd, the date of the assassination, but some were "recovered" on November 23rd and at later times. They were "recovered" generally not at the "scene" but at Parkland Memorial Hospital, Bethesda Naval Hospital in Maryland, and at other places, including Washington, D.C.

More important, defendant states as a matter of fact (see page one of its Statement of Material Facts) that the records sought "are part of an 'investigatory file compiled for law enforcement purposes.'" It is plaintiff's contention that this is incorrect and that the records in fact were not compiled for any law enforcement purpose but exclusively as part of an investigation instituted by President Lyndon B. Johnson on November 24, 1963, Executive Order 11130; and S. J. Res. 137, 88th Congress... none of which involved "law enforcement."

The remainder of this memo will deal with this latest question which appears to be a mixed question of fact and law.

II.

ARGUMENT

On page two of his Memorandum of Points and Authorities, defendant purports to claim exemption (b)(7) currently as "investigatory files compiled for law enforcement purposes except to the extent available by law to a party other than an agency." Plaintiff then adds "the thrust of the exemption is to protect from disclosure all files which the government compiles in the course of law enforcement investigations which may or may not lead to

formal proceedings." [underscoring added.]. The thrust may or may not be in accordance with the underscored clause, but it is clear that there are two explicit limitations on the exemption for "investigatory files":

1) they are exempt only if compiled for law enforcement purposes, and

2) they are exempt only if they would not be available by law to a private party.

As to whether there was a "law enforcement purpose" in compilation of the sought spectrographic analyses, no better witness can be found than FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover. In testimony before the Warren Commission on May 14, 1964, the following colloquy took place between Mr. Hoover and Mr. J. Lee Rankin, General Counsel to the Commission:

> Mr. Rankin. You have provided many things to us in assisting the Commission in connection with this investigation and I assume, at least in a general way, you are familiar with the investigation of the assassination of President Kennedy, is that correct?
>
> Mr. Hoover. That is correct. When President Johnson returned to Washington he communicated with me within the first 24 hours, and asked the Bureau to pick up the investigation of the assassination because as you are aware, there is no Federal jurisdiction for such an investigation. It is not a Federal crime to kill or attack the President or the Vice President or any of the multiplicity of officers who would succeed to the Presidency.
>
> However, the President has a right to request the Bureau to make special investigations, and in this instance he asked that this investigation be made. I immediately assigned a special force headed by the special agent in charge at Dallas, Texas, to initiate the investigation, and to get all details and facts concerning it, which we obtained, and then prepared a report which we submitted to the Attorney General for transmission to the President.
>
> [Hearings before the Warren Commission, Vol. 5, p. 86. Underscoring added.]

Thus, according to the FBI's Director, there was no law and, hence, there could be no "law enforcement purpose." In fact,

according to Mr. Shaver, when the investigation was undertaken, there was no federal jurisdiction for it at all, except a request by the President.

Lest the argument be made that perhaps the missing law was a law of the State of Texas, it should be noted that the spectrographic analyses were not given to either the Texas or [illegible] authorities.

In brief, the spectrographic analyses were made as part of an investigation requested by the President and by the FBI in the investigative aid of the Warren Commission. Backing up the lack of any "law enforcement purpose" is the following quote from the foreword to the Commission's Report (at p. XIV):

> "The Commission has functioned neither as a court presiding over an adversary proceeding nor as a prosecutor determined to prove a case, but as a fact finding agency committed to the ascertainment of the truth."

This contention is further strengthened by the Commission's Tenth Recommendation:

> "The Commission recommends to Congress that it enact legislation which would make the assassination of the President and Vice President a federal crime. A state of affairs where U.S. authorities have not clearly defined jurisdiction to investigate the assassination of a President is anomalous. [Page 24 of the Report]

"Law enforcement purposes" requires a law of some kind. Therefore, the burden is on the defendant, if he wishes to avail himself of exception (b)(7), to state specifically what criminal law or laws in pursuance of which the spectrographic analyses were made. So far, he has not met that burden.

Page 6

III.

[redacted]

The second qualification in (b)(7) is that "investigatory files" cannot be withheld from the public if they would be "available by law to a party other than an agency."

Plaintiff is not an "agency" and it is his contention that under Jencks the spectrographic analyses would certainly have been available to Lee Harvey Oswald. Hence, they cannot be withheld from plaintiff.

As the Warren Commission said in its preface: "If Oswald had lived he could have had a trial by American standards of justice where he would have been able to exercise his full rights under the law."

IV.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT (5 U.S.C. 522)

Emphasis is placed in defendant's Memorandum of Points and Authorities to the legislative history of exemption (b)(7), especially in the House of Representatives. Quoted herewith is the sum total of explanation given in the House Report on this exemption (Report No. 1497, House of Representatives, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, at p.11):

> " 7. Investigatory files compiled for law enforcement purposes except to the extent available by law to a private party: This exemption covers investigatory files related to enforcement of all kinds of laws, labor and securities laws as well as criminal laws. This would include files prepared in connection with related Government litigation and adjudicative proceedings. It is not intended to give a private party indirectly any earlier or greater access to investigatory files than he would have directly in such litigation or proceedings."

[redacted] is also considerable reference in the defendant's [redacted] [redacted] to [redacted] on the floor of the house. The questions and [redacted] out of context, and generally irrelevant in view of [redacted] of exemption (b)(7). The debate is not very helpful in [redacted] legislative intent. It is true that some members [redacted] to omit (b)(7) in its entirety or to amend it in [redacted] however, they did not prevail. (b)(7) stayed in. As [redacted] the committee said it stayed in in its present text. The [redacted] was certainly drawn in specific terms, and there is no [redacted] that any "sensitive" government information is [redacted] exempted.

In this regard, FBI files are like those of any [redacted] agency. Whether a particular FBI file is exempt from disclosure depends on whether it falls within one of the nine exemptions, not whether it is "sensitive." Parenthetically, [redacted] "sensitive" about spectrographic analyses of bullets and [redacted] information sent in a fact finding investigation in 1968?

Spectrographic analyses, like other scientific [redacted] evidence, are not sensitive and should never be withheld. [redacted] spectrographic analyses can be withheld from a defendant in a criminal case, other scientific evidence, such as autopsies and fingerprints, could also be withheld. This would lead to [redacted] and patently unfair results.

V.

CONCLUSION

The primary allusion in defendant's opposition [redacted] [redacted] v. Gordon, 271 F. Supp. 578, is to the

following sentence from Attorney General Clark's Memorandum of June, 1947.

> "..... In addition, the House report makes it clear that litigants are not to obtain special benefits from this provision, stating that S.1160 is not intended to give a private party indirectly any earlier or greater access to investigatory files than he would have directly in such litigation or proceeding. (H.Report 1)"

It is clear that the Attorney General was speaking, the "litigant" would be Lee Harvey Oswald. The plaintiff in the present case seeks no "earlier or greater access" than would have been available to Oswald, had he lived to be tried; conversely, he seeks the same right of access as Oswald. And under Jencks, Oswald would have been entitled to the spectrographic analyses.

On page 3 of its Enumeration of Points and Authorities, defendant quotes at some length from Clement Brothers v. [illegible], 168 F. Supp. 540. Unfortunately, defendant omitted what is probably the most important paragraph in the decision, the one immediately preceding the three quoted:

> " The Court must agree that the determination of the Court is reasonable, though not controlling on this Court. In addition to the common sense necessity of protecting the investigatory function and processes of the Board, the legislative history of the Act itself makes it clear that the exemption in question is not limited solely to pricing by enforcement but rather applies to law enforcement activities of all natures."

Conceding arguendo that this is true, both Jencks and Clement are irrelevant in the present case where there is no law enforcement, criminal or otherwise. Further, there is no "common sense necessity" in protecting scientific tests such as spectrographic analyses, as compared to protecting witness statements before trial.

Puzzlingly, defendant goes on: "In the instant case, the records plaintiff seeks have not been made part of any court

[illegible] any agency proceeding he may not obtain them "absent a showing that they had been part of any record in any agency proceeding [illegible] they could automatically be available. Also, the analyses [illegible] by Warren Commission as explained below, [illegible] by the Commission's basic conclusion of a "single, [illegible] assassin."

The last case cited by the defendant is Black v. [illegible], 50 F.R.D. 138-139 (D D.C. 1970). Again, the quoted [illegible] misleading. In the first place, the case concerns the [illegible] of Rule 34 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, not [illegible] 45, and only in passing. Second, when considered in [illegible] the court rejects the language of the Congressional [illegible] investigatory files compiled for law enforcement [illegible] to the extent available by law to a party other [illegible] Third, the following holding preceded the [illegible] upon and cited:

> "As background for the present motion, the [illegible] notes that the United States has previously made [illegible] available to the plaintiff copies of all documents in the FBI files which contain information from the surveillance. These include: (1) all logs of the surveillance, which are the actual records made [illegible] some of the agents who overheard the inquiry during (2) all monthly airtels prepared from the logs, which are typewritten summaries of the [illegible] in the logs; (3) copies of all previous [illegible] reports which contain information obtained from the surveillances; and (4) two memoranda from the Director of the FBI to the Attorney General [illegible] the latter of the information which he had received from the surveillance."

[illegible] counsel is certainly entitled to all the [illegible] previously delivered. In fact, to the extent that [illegible] to the present case at all, it would appear to [illegible] favor of plaintiff. Even the Black court held that [illegible] were certain additional records of surveillance [illegible]

illegal wiretap; revelation of these could have incurred [illegible] the identity of informants, agents leads in cases [illegible] among, embrace the FBI, etc.; some of these have could [illegible] through making available the spectrographic analyses in the [illegible] case.

In summary, none of the cases cited by defendant is directly in point, and to the extent that they are relevant, [illegible] a decision upon the question of the withholding of [illegible] of the nature sought in this case.

VI.

CONCLUSION

In signing the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. [illegible]) into law on July 4, 1966, President Johnson said: "I have always believed that freedom of information is so vital that only a [illegible] security, not the desire of public officials or private [illegible] should determine when it must be restricted." [The Government's statement is here is reproduced as Exhibit I hereto.]

In terms of Congressional intention as the FOIA [illegible] 1967, Attorney General Clark stated:

> "This law was initiated by Congress and signed by the President with several key concerns:
> - that disclosure be the general rule, not the exception;
> - that all individuals have equal rights of access;
> - that the burden be on the Government to justify the withholding of a document, not on the person who requests it;
> - that individuals improperly denied access to documents have a right to seek injunctive relief in the courts;
> - that there be a change in Government policy and attitude.
>
> [All of Attorney General Clark's remarks are reproduced as Exhibit II hereto.]

A provocative note in the Harvard Law Review (Vol. [illegible] 1967, p. 314) suggests that "it seems that such investigations could be made available after the enforcement activity in question has been completed." Doubly so where there is no "enforcement activity" but only "fact finding."

In the Conclusion to its Memorandum of Points and Authorities, defendant says that "Congress particularly intended in the Public Information Act a prohibition against the release to the public of the type of document plaintiff seeks in the instant action. But, there is no prohibition, as evidenced in the [illegible] quotation from a letter of May 7, 1976 to plaintiff's counsel in response to another Freedom of Information suit in this District (Exh. 70):

> "Whether or not the documents you seek are technically exempt under one or more of the provisions of 552(b), I have determined that you shall be granted access to them. The exemptions do not require that records falling within them be withheld; they merely authorize the withholding of such records, by excepting them from the [illegible] otherwise applicable compulsory disclosure requirements."
>
> [The full text of this letter is printed as Exhibit III hereto.]

When one looks at the history and spirit of 5 U.S.C. 552, and considers what is the real reason for withholding in this case, there is no question of divulging the identities of informants. There is no question of divulging secret investigative techniques. There is no question of embarrassment to private citizens.

If the spectrographic analyses in fact prove what the government witnesses before the Warren Commission imply (and there is a "common source" for all bullets and bullet fragments), there appear to be no valid reason why the government should withhold them, even as a matter of policy. If, on the other hand, they do not prove what the witnesses imply, there is no [illegible]

reason to wish to withhold them, i.e., the whole Warren Commission report and its conclusions come tumbling down.

Plaintiff does not ask, however, that these records be made available to him as a matter of policy or grace. It is [illegible] contention that he is entitled to access to them under 5 U.S.C. 552 as a matter of law.

Therefore, the Court is asked to grant this defendant's motion to dismiss and for summary judgment and to set the case for trial near the head of the docket, as provided in 5 U.S.C. 552 (a)(3):

> Except as to causes the court considers of greater importance, proceedings before the District Court, as authorized by this paragraph, take precedence on the docket over all other causes and shall be assigned for hearing and trial at the earliest practicable date and expedited in every way.

Plaintiff renews his request that the Court enjoin the defendant from further withholding of the records sought.

Respectfully submitted,

[redacted]
927 15th St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel: 527-6380
Attorney for Plaintiff

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that service of this answer has been made upon Thomas A. Flannery, Joseph M. Hannon, and Robert [illegible], Jr., U.S. Courthouse, Washington, D.C., on this [illegible] day of December, 1970.

[redacted]